UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,896	09/10/2003	Thomas W. Smith	79544	8996

23501   7590   03/10/2008
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DAHLGREN DIVISION
OFFICE OF COUNSEL, CODE XDC1
17632 DAHLGREN ROAD
SUITE 121
DAHLGREN, VA 22448-5110

EXAMINER
CHEA, PHILIP J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 November 2007_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed November 29, 2007. Claims 1-20 are currently

pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-3,5-7,9-12,17,19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Edelman et al. (US 7,240,077), herein referred to as Edelman, further in view of Peck et al. (US

2002/0188636), herein referred to as Peck.

As per claims 1,17, Edelman discloses a method including the limitations for a baseline web site

that is primarily and ordinarily read-only, having a plurality of web pages being remotely accessible by

authorized users through a network via client communication devices communicatively coupled to the

network, the web pages having displayable information (see column 3, lines 15-31, *where the baseline*

web site is considered the live web site that is currently published; furthermore, since the website is

published, it is implied that the site is accessible by users through a network (e.g. the Internet) via devices

such as a computer and read only since the users do not have access rights to publish source code to the

hosting web server (see column 1, lines 11-33));

a mirror web site that includes initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site *(see column 5, lines*

17-40, where the mirror web site is considered the copy *of the live (i.e. baseline) web site (see Fig. 5) that*

the user is able to edit and then publish to the live web site at a specific date and time, it is initially a

mirror web site because it is a web site that is initially (i.e. before any edits) a copy of the baseline web

site; see Fig. 5, where a user can edit a mirror copy of the live (i.e. baseline) web site and column 6, lines

8-12, describing how the facility provides a content change receiving tool/interface for the current release

that is based on the state of the live web site) and that is remotely accessible by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network (see column 4, lines 7-10, *describing a remote access and column 4, lines 40-47, where only authorized users are able to make changes*); and,

a web application running on the mirror web site to accept the user-made changes to the mirror information on the mirror copy of the baseline web site (see column 5, lines 17-40, *where tools (e.g. image manager tool, browser builder tool, site merchandiser tool) are provided to allow a user make changes to the mirror copy that will be published to the live (i.e. baseline) web site at a specific date and time)*, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site (see column 6, lines 14-17, *where the administrator can preview future releases and approve them*).

Although the system disclosed by Edelman shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose user made changes to the mirror information on the mirror copy in a cut-and-paste manner.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Edelman, as evidenced by Peck.

In an analogous art, Peck discloses a software package for editing web-based documents where a user can select a web-based document and perform editing operations on the web-based document (see Abstract). Peck further discloses that the editing operations performed can be user made changes in a cut-and-paste manner (see paragraph 45, *describing how a user can paste text cut from another document or another area of the web-based document)*.

Given the teaching of Peck, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Edelman by employing a cut-and-paste editing function, such as disclosed by Peck, in order to copy text that has already been composed elsewhere instead of retyping the desired text. Furthermore, considering that Edelman discloses making changes to a mirror copy of a live website (i.e. baseline), it would be obvious that the cut and paste operations are performed on the mirror copy that will later be published to the live website after admin approval.

With respect to claims 2,20, Edelman in view of Peck further discloses wherein the web application is receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner (see Edelman column 7, lines 5-12, and discussion above regarding the obvious use of cut-and-paste). Edelman does not expressly disclose that the cut-and-paste is from other applications running on the client communication devices. However, Peck discloses the cut and paste operation being done from another document (i.e. other application) (see paragraph 45), it would have been obvious that the application hosting the document is running on the client communication device because the client is editing the mirror site from his own machine.

With respect to claim 3, Edelman teach a method including the limitation for wherein the other applications running on the client communication devices comprise at least one of: word processing application programs, spreadsheet application programs, email communication application programs, graphics application programs, scheduling application programs, presentation application programs, streamlining video and/or clip application programs, and web browsing application programs (see column 4, lines 7-10, where it's implied a web browser is used to access a web site hosting facility, and it would further be obvious, given the discussion above to copy-and-paste text so that a person would not have to type every single letter if there is already text written for them to copy).

With respect to claim 5, Edelman teach a method including the limitation for wherein the mirror web site have a home web page that is regulated by a secure network connection through the network (see column 4, lines 40-47) and from which other web pages on the web site are accessible via hyperlinks (see column 9, lines 46-49). Edelman does not expressly disclose that the baseline web site is regulated by a secure network connection through the network. However, Edelman shows that the baseline web site can be a commerce web site (see column 1, lines 20-33). At the time of the invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide a secure network connection in order to prevent hackers from stealing sensitive information such as credit card numbers and home addresses.

With respect to claim 6, Edelman teach a method including the limitation for wherein the baseline web site and the mirror web site each have a home web page that is regulated by a secure network

connection through the network (see Fig. 5, where a user can log into edit mode from the homepage) and from which other web pages on the web site are accessible via hyperlinks (see column 9, lines 46-49).

With respect to claim 7, Edelman teach a method including the limitation for wherein the baseline web site further has a plurality of second web pages to serve as electronic notebooks containing information related to and supporting the plurality of web pages (see column 4, lines 40-47, where different vendors can be in charge of their own web page (i.e. electronic notebook)) and different of the plurality of second web pages accessible by different of the authorized users via different levels of access accorded to different of the authorized users (see column 4, lines 40-47).

With respect to claim 9, Edelman teach a method including the limitation for providing at least one server to host at least one of the baseline web site and the mirror web site and each server communicatively coupled to the network (see column 4, lines 7-11).

With respect to claim 10, Edelman teach a method including the limitation further comprising at least some of the client communication devices (see column 6, line 60 – column 7, line 4).

With respect to claim 11, Edelman teach a method including the limitation wherein the client communication devices comprise at least one of: a computing device, a desktop computing device, a laptop computing device, a handheld computing device, a mobile phone, and a special-purpose device (see column 6, line 60 – column 7, line 4).

With respect to claim 12, Edelman teach a method including the limitation wherein the network comprises one or more of: the Internet, an intranet, an extranet, a virtual private network (VPN), a local-area network (LAN), a wide-area network (WAN), a wired network, and a wireless network (see column 4, lines 9-11).

With respect to claim 19, Edelman teach a method including the limitation wherein accessing by the authorized user of the baseline web site comprises remotely accessing the baseline web site through a network via a client communication device communicatively coupled to the network (see column 6, line 64 – column 7, line 2).

3.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Gordon et al. (US 2002/0064352).

Edelman does not expressly disclose wherein the additional and replacement data comprises scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media.

The general concept of using the additional and replacement data comprises scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media is well known in the art as illustrated by Gordon et al, which teaches a method including the limitation for wherein the additional and replacement data comprises scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media (see e.g. [0018], which implies this limitation because a scanner is used to input score information into the database containing all league information, which may be published on a web site, as shown in sec. [0026]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Edelman to include the use of using the additional and replacement data comprises scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media in order to maximize efficiency of updating content to be displayed on a published web site, as implied in sec. [0015] of Gordon et al.

4.   Claims 8,13-14,16,18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman in view of Peck as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Shuping et al. (US 6,313,855).

As per claim 8, Edelman, as discussed above discloses many of the claimed features. However, Edelman does not expressly disclose providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room.

The general concepts of a limitation for providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room is well known in the art as illustrated by Shuping et al, which teaches a method including the limitation for providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room (see spec, sec. 2, lines 44-58, which implies this limitation because a room is implemented for a number of panel displays to display the updated web info).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Edelman to include the use of a limitation for providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room in order to improve upon updating pages on a web site, as implied in sec. 2, lines 10-34 of Shuping et al.

In reference to claim 13, although the system of Edelman teaches substantial claimed features (see discussion above) it does not expressly disclose the baseline web site is for primary display on a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple-user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room, the baseline web site and the mirror web site locally accessible within the room.

The general concepts of a limitation wherein the baseline web site is for primary display on a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple-user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room, the baseline web site and the mirror web site locally accessible within the room is well known in the art as illustrated by Shuping et al, which teaches a method including the limitation wherein the baseline web site is for primary display on a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple-user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room, the baseline web site and the mirror web site locally accessible within the room (see spec, sec. 7, lines 29-39, which implies this limitation because the wall within the room displays the past web page of a web site and the current page/version of a web site).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Edelman to include the use of a limitation wherein the baseline web site is for primary display on a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple-user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room, the baseline web site and the mirror web site locally accessible within the room in order to improve upon updating pages on a web site, as implied in sec. 2, lines 10-34 of Shuping et al.

In reference to claim 14, Edelman in view of Peck further teach a method including the limitations for at least one server to host a baseline web site and a mirror web site, each server communicatively coupled to a network (see column 4, lines 7-19, where web site hosting facility offers the live web site (i.e. baseline) and tools to edit the web site for future release date (i.e. editing a mirror copy of the website)

and column 6, lines 8-12, describing how the facility provides a content change receiving tool/interface for the current release that is based on the state of the live web site),

the baseline web site being primarily and ordinarily read-only, the mirror web site being initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site (see column 3, lines 15-31), and remotely accessible outside of the room by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network, the web pages having displayable information (see column 4, lines 7-11); and,

the mirror web site for user-made changes to mirror information on the mirror copy in a cut-and-paste manner (see Peck paragraph 45).

a web application running on the mirror web site to accept the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site (see column 5, lines 17-40, where tools (e.g. image manager tool, browser builder tool, site merchandiser tool) are provided to allow a user make changes to the mirror copy that will be published to the live (i.e. baseline) web site at a specific date and time), one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site (see column 6, lines 14-17, where the administrator can preview future releases and approve them).

Edelman teach all the limitations as disclosed above except for providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room and wherein the web application is receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices.

The general concepts of a limitation providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room and wherein the web application is receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices are well known in the art as illustrated by Shuping et al, which teaches a system including the limitation providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room (see spec, sec. 2, lines 44-58, which implies this limitation because a room is implemented for

a number of panel displays to display the updated web info) and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices (see spec, sec. 9, lines 50-59, which implies this limitation because applications are imbedded within the invention for copying and pasting of the updated data to the web pages on the updated web site).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Edelman to include the use of a limitation for providing a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on the walls of the room and wherein the web application is receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices in order to improve upon updating pages on a web site, as implied in sec. 2, lines 10-34 of Shuping et al.

With respect to claim 16, Edelman further discloses at least some of the client communication devices locatable within the room (see column 6, line 59 – column 7, line 2, where PDA is located in the same room).

With respect to claim 18, although the system of Edelman teaches many of the claimed features (see discussion above), Edelman does not expressly disclose viewing the baseline web site on one of a plurality of multiple user-viewable displays mounted on walls of a room.

The general concept for viewing the baseline web site on one of a plurality of multiple user-viewable displays mounted on walls of a room is well known in the art as illustrated by Shuping et al, which teaches a method for viewing the baseline web site on one of a plurality of multiple user-viewable displays mounted on walls of a room (see spec, sec. 4, lines 25-39, and sec. 6, lines 45-52, which implies this limitation because the communications devices are interfaced with the panels located in the display room through the communications network).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Edelman to include the use of a limitation for viewing the baseline web site on one of a plurality of multiple

user-viewable displays mounted on walls of a room in order to improve upon updating pages on a web

site, as implied in sec. 2, lines 10-34 of Shuping et al.

13.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Edelman in view of Peck in

view of Shuping et al. with respect to claim 14 above and Gordon et al (Pub # 2004/0064352).

         In reference to claim 15, Edelman in view of Peck in view of Shuping do not expressly disclose

scanning devices locatable within the room to generate scanned-in information from non-electronic

hardcopy media as the additional and replacement data.

         The general concept of a limitation for providing one or more scanning devices locatable within

the room to generate scanned-in information from non-electronic hardcopy media as the additional and

replacement data is well known in the art as illustrated by Gordon et al, which teaches a method including

the limitation for providing one or more scanning devices locatable within the room to generate scanned-

in information from non-electronic hardcopy media as the additional and replacement data (see e.g.

[0018], which implies this limitation because a scanner is used to input score information into the

database containing all league information, which may be published on a web site, as shown in sec.

[0026]).

          It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Edelman to include the use of a limitation for providing one or more scanning devices locatable

within the room to generate scanned-in information from non-electronic hardcopy media as the additional

and replacement data in order to maximize efficiency of updating content to be displayed on a published

web site, as implied in sec. [0015] of Gordon et al.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed November 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

A)   Applicant contends that Edelman does not disclose a web application running on the mirror web site to accept user made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut and paste manner, such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site.

In considering A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Edelman shows the web application running on the mirror web site in Fig. 5. There are explicit editing functions that can be performed on this mirror site such as, editing the layout and inline messages. The site is considered a mirror web site because this is not the site that is being shown to users on the internet, but rather is a mirror copy based on the state of the live website that authorized users may edit. The edits performed on the mirror web site are periodically published to the live web site (i.e. the baseline website is periodically updated from the mirror web site) based on specific schedule of day and time. Furthermore, additional evidence to support the new scope of cut-and-paste user-made changes to the mirror information has been provided by Peck. Please see rejection above.

B)   Applicant contends there is no motivation to combine Gordon with Edelman.

In considering B), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Gordon teaches that non-electronic information can be scanned in to become electronic information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the idea of scanned in non-electronic documents because some documents are not available electronically and therefore must be converted to electronic form in order to be posted on a web site. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Gordon with Edelman.

C)   Applicant contends that there is no motivation to combine Shuping with Edelman.

In considering C), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it is obvious that productivity is increased when more than one web page can be displayed at a time. Being that they are on a wall, a team of web developers could suggest changes to the web site at the same time while looking at the baseline web site on one display and comparing the mirror web site on the other display. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Shuping with Edelman in order to increase productivity.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP J. CHEA whose telephone number is (571)272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Glenton   Burgess/   Philip J Chea
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2153   Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 2153

PJC 2/20/08